DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 784 HE 030 930

AUTHOR	Hayden, Sandra R
TITLE	The Ombuds Office in Higher Education.
PUB DATE	1997-12-00
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Advocacy; *Arbitration; College Faculty; College Students; *Conflict Resolution; *Grievance Procedures; *Higher Education; Institutional Personnel; *Ombudsmen; Problem Solving; Student Personnel Services; Students; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	University of Florida

ABSTRACT

This document analyzes the responses to a survey conducted in 1997 on the role of the Ombuds Office in higher education, and also considers the characteristics of professional neutrality needed for successful conflict resolution. Of 178 institutions surveyed, 109 responses include 54 institutions with ombudsmen, 7 without such a position but with related information, and 48 with neither. The document examines programs at the respondent institutions, noting the year the position was established (for the 54 institutions with a formal office), and the supervising authority for the office (the president being the most frequently cited). Also discussed and tabulated are other positions held by ombudspeople, the quality of the authority, and the breakdown of clients, cases, and resolution times. The wide range of programs is attributed to the lack of a centralized concept, which permits each institution to develop a model suited to its own requirements; such models serve, variously, only students, students and faculty, faculty and staff, or students, faculty, and staff. Appended are a summary of student traffic in 1997 at the Ombuds Office of the University of Florida by month, sex, race, academic year, college, and category of complaint, and a list of survey participants. (Contains 13 references.) (BF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 415 784

THE OMBUDS OFFICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Sandra R. Hayden
University of Florida
December 1997

HE 030 930

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra R. Hayden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE OMBUDS OFFICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The word "Ombudsman" originated in Sweden and means "representative of the people." Ombudsmen in higher education are liaisons or mediators, assisting in resolving all sorts of problems associated with the institution. Arnold (1995) defines the Ombudsman as a third-party fact finder/adjuster who remains neutral while investigating complaints or grievances. Within academe the term commonly refers to the system through which one can seek to rectify administrative abuses or errors (Stieber, 1991).

To better understand the exact responsibility and role of the office in higher education, a survey was mailed to 178 universities and colleges, mostly members of the Association of American Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Additionally, surveys were sent to other institutions known to have an ombuds office. The survey and letter of introduction explaining the project were available on the University of Florida's Ombudsman's web page (University of Florida, 1997) and were additionally mailed and electronically submitted to the institutions. Institutions were given the option of responding by submitting a hard copy or completing the survey online and electronically transmitting it. Of the 109 responding institutions, 29 electronically transmitted the survey. Response rate for the survey was 61%.

Institutional Type in Survey	#
Institutions ***with*** Ombuds	54
Institutions ***without*** Ombuds but ***with*** Ombuds ***information***	7
Institutions ***without*** Ombuds or Ombuds information	48
Institutions - No Response	69
TOTAL Surveyed	**178**

Of the 55 institutions that did not have an established Ombuds position, 7 responded with varying numbers of cases handled each year, ranging from as few as 10 to as many as 1380. Although the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee does not have an established ombuds program, the Dean of Students there devotes approximately 20 hours per week to Ombuds issues, servicing 1,380 cases annually for students and faculty.

Ohio State University does not have an established position, but handles Ombuds' issues through the Student Advocacy Center. Approximately 1,200 students, faculty and staff issues, problems, and concerns are handled through the Advocacy Center.

The University of Minnesota refers to its Ombuds Office as the Student Dispute Resource Center, and services between 700 and 800 students annually. The center provides a wide range of services to students with campus-based complaints, disputes or concerns. Beneficial to Minnesota's program is the "Student Statement," which is available on the web site for students to electronically submit their concerns to the office. Upon receiving a statement, an office staff member contacts the student to work on resolution of the concerns (University of Minnesota, 1997).

In 1992 a Chancellor's Task Force at the University of California-Davis undertook a study of campus grievance practices. Based on this study the Chancellor decided not to create an Ombuds Office and accepted the recommendation to develop a campus mediation program. Through this program various offices were assigned responsibility for grievances, with Student Judicial Affairs assuming the responsibility of managing student grievances.

Ombuds offices were established and created in academe in response to a demand for less bureaucracy and a more informal approach to problem solving. For more than three decades Ombuds services have been provided in various higher-education institutions in the nation (Spratlen & Neff, 1996). Student protests and educational disruptions in the 1960s led administrators to implement creative responses to student demands for less bureaucracy and a more humane approach to providing programs and services to students (Hoppe & Culhane, 1995). The survey data regarding dates of establishment further indicated that some offices were established as early as 1966, and the most recent office was established at the University of Utah in June 1997.

Ombuds Position Established	Number of Institutions
1966	1
1967	1
1968	3
1969	6
1970	2
1971	2
1972	4
1977	1
1978	1
1983	1
1985	1
1988	1
1989	1
1990	3
1991	3
1992	1
1993	2
1994	2
1995	6
1996	1
1997	1
1970s	2
Yes, no date	8
TOTAL	**54**

Receipt of the survey by the University of Utah generated communications and interest in the Ombuds program. The administration was in the process of establishing an office and was seeking information about the development, role and responsibility of the ombuds role at other institutions.

At the inception of the Ombuds offices in the 1960s there was no centralized concept or model for creating an office to assist students or the university community. Each institution is unique in its culture, location, size, and type. Thus, a customized and personal approach was used by each institution to establish the office to fit the requirements and needs of its students and community (Spratlen & Neff, 1996). As indicated by the data received, a majority of the institutions established the reporting authority of the Ombuds office to the President and chief administrator of the school.

Supervising Authority	Number of Institutions
Affirmative Action	1
Chancellor	3
Chancellor for Business	1
Dean of Students/Student Life	5
Dean of Undergraduate Studies	1
Deputy Chancellor	1
Executive Vice Chancellor	1
Judicial Affairs	1
Ombuds' faculty office	1
President	17
Provost	5.5
Student Affairs/Activities	6
Student Govt.	1
Student Judicial Affairs	2
VP Acad. Affairs	2
VP Human Resources	1.5
VP/Vice Chancellor Student Affairs	8
TOTAL	**58**

Ombudsmen in academe hold a unique, strategic, and privileged position, with ultimate responsibility for conflict negotiation and dispute resolution (Wilson, 1996). In fulfilling the duties associated with this role, Ombudsmen utilize diversified approaches in their efforts to support and achieve satisfaction and resolution for their clientele. Crucial to this role is the ability to offer requisite checks and balances to monitor

administrative decisions while serving as a control instrument for balancing flagrant misuses and abuses of power (Guerra & Elliott, 1996).

The Ombudsman should be a neutral professional, consulting within the institution, but apart from the normal hierarchical chain of command (Stieber, 1991). This office and position are alternative channels for handling complaints and concerns. Generally speaking, an Ombudsman acts as independently as possible of all other offices and avoids conflict of interest, external control, and either the reality or appearance of being compromised (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). Although the Ombudsman should not be associated with any particular administrative level, many Ombudsmen serve their institutions in a dual role with varying levels of authority and responsibility. The Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics explicitly states "We are designated neutrals and remain independent of ordinary line and staff structures. We serve no additional role (within the organization where we serve as ombudsman) which would compromise this neutrality" (Hoppe and Culhane, 1995).

Other Positions Held by Ombudsman	**#**
Affirmative Action Staff	1
Associate VP for Administration. & Planning	1
Asso./Asst. Dean of Students	1
Dean of Students	2
Dean/Director Undergraduate Advising	2
Director Judicial Affairs	3
Director Student Advocate Center	2
Exec Asst. to VP/Vice Chancellor Student Affairs	5
Exec. Asst. to President	2
Faculty	10
National Student Exchange Coordinator.	1
Student	5
Student Affairs Staff	2
Volunteer Committee	1
TOTAL	**38**

Readily recognized by all who fill this role is the understanding that a rule or policy is a general statement that cannot possibly foresee or account for all circumstances (Vice, 1996). It is essential than an Ombudsman have the ability to "cut through formalities" to do justice to the specific circumstances of a given situation. The ombudsman acts as an independent "agent of justice" who, if the situation warrants, investigates complaints and the conditions leading up to the complaints and attempts to work with all parties involved to mediate a satisfactory solution (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). Vice (1996) further believes that as legislative bodies initiate and impose laws, educational institutions formulate and impose general rules and procedures without forethought being given to unforeseen circumstances to incorporate the "gray" area or unusual complications. The Ombudsman fulfills this task by exercising judgment and making choices on decisions and employing common sense (Vice, 1996).

The role and mission of the Ombuds office is to serve the institutional community by hearing and investigating complaints or problems brought by members of the community who feels they have been treated unfairly by the institution or who need help in resolving a problem (Spratlen & Neff, 1996). Motivationally, the Ombudsman is generally focused on maintaining and building the university community (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). In conducting the business of the office, Ombudsmen must strictly adhere to and be guided by the principles of objectivity, independence, accessibility, confidentiality, and justice (University of California-Berkeley, 1997).

Dispute or conflict resolution between various levels of university students, faculty, staff, and administrators necessitates and requires independence, confidentiality, identification of equitable options and choices, as well as respect for all parties involved (Guerra and Elliott, 1996). Conflict resolution is often the result of cleverness and subtle manipulation instead of force or implied power. Ombudsmen are often recognized as fair and just arbitrators with the full support of the president and chief administrative officers. The perceived or implied clout and authority of the Ombudsman are often backed by the full support of the president (Stieber, 1991). Both the designation of neutrality and direct access and the support from the president help to contribute to the effectiveness of the Ombuds office (Rowe, 1995). Presidential support often results in an accused party reconsidering their position regarding a decision viewed as unfair, arbitrary, or detrimental to the student or grieved party. The perception of impartiality is a key to successful resolution and provides a strong basis for facilitating an equitable solution (Rowe, 1995).

The central role and theme of an Ombuds office is to maintain and build relationships. The use of implicit power and authority encourages accused parties to make fair and just decisions while maintaining congenial and ongoing relationships, particularly with the administration (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). This approach is very instrumental in opening lines of effective, direct, and ongoing communications among all parties. A chief skill required of anyone in the position of Ombudsman is the ability to effectively communicate and listen objectively to both sides of an issue (Hayden, 1996).

Instrumental to the Ombuds role is the ability to consider and not jeopardize relationships or future communications or interactions between the parties (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). Regardless of the relationship, it is always wisest to use gentle or subtle intervention as the first approach to a problem or conflict out of respect to accused parties and their professional esteem or position (Stieber, 1991). Sound judgment and intervention are essential tools for the Ombudsman in determining mechanisms and avenues for negotiating a settlement or resolving a conflict without any parties perceiving that they are being wounded or their authority is being challenged (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). The approach used for any particular situation must be as diverse and unique as the academic population served—this requires forethought and creativity on the part of the Ombudsman. In instances when negotiation, manipulation, and powers of persuasion fail, it may be necessary for the Ombudsman to use explicit power in a direct and forceful intervention by presenting the problem to the next level of authority, such as a Department/Division Chair or Director (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). All avenues of persuasion, negotiation and manipulation should first be exhausted in order to prevent any feelings of ill will toward the Ombuds office or the perception of misuse of power and authority (Stieber, 1991).

Of the 54 institutions with Ombuds offices, only two—the University of Florida and the University of Washington--reported that they have the authority to overrule decisions or implement procedures. A variety of reasons were reported as to the authority of the Ombuds office in overruling decisions, with the most prominent being "recommend only." Adherence to the "recommend only" and "persuasion" authority is a strong indicator that the institutional community is cognizant of the chief administrative support given to the Ombuds (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). Although only two institutions indicated they had the authority to overrule decisions or implement procedures, seven reported that the decision of the Ombuds is final and three reported this final decision was appealable to either (1) the Vice President for Student Affairs, (2) sometimes the President, and/or (3) variable offices.

Authority Based On	Number of Institutions
"Clout"	1
Mediation	1
Negotiate	2
Persuasion	6
Persuasion & Status	1
Recommend Only	8
Suggestion	1
Varies by situation	4
Total	**24**

A frequent misconception and fallacy among people utilizing the services of the Ombuds office is that the office replaces existing systems for governance (Vice, 1996). Rather, the office is first a resource office, thereby guiding individuals through the normal channels and processes associated with their problems (Hayden, 1996).

Clientele served by the office vary from (1) students only; (2) students and faculty; (3) students, faculty, and staff; and (4) faculty and staff only. An excellent indicator of the effectiveness of the office and its benefit to the institution is gauged by the number of clients served.

A chief component in establishing an effective and efficient Ombuds office is availability/accessibility and response time (Guerra & Elliott, 1996). Students view their problems as unique to a particular situation or as a result of bureaucratic red tape. It is imperative that they be extended the courtesy and consideration of having their concerns or problems addressed in a timely fashion. Early intervention is a key to a mutually satisfactory resolution to the complaint (Spratlen & Neff, 1996).

A chief component in determining understanding and satisfaction is through direct and effective communication (University of Florida, 1997). Unfortunately, many administrative offices render form letters notifying students of both positive and negative decisions. Negative decisions are more easily and readily accepted if accompanied by an explanation as to "why." The explanation not only explains the decision but also leaves the impression and perception that the student was provided the individual treatment and consideration warranted by the situation (Hayden, 1996).

A breakdown of the groups served by the various institutional Ombuds offices, average annual cases, and response times shows:

Clients	# Institutions	Avg. # Cases	Resolution time
Faculty, Staff	1	50-100	Varies
Students	33	348	.25 - 30 days
Students, Faculty	2	418	varies to 14 days
Students, Faculty, Staff	23	303	.5 to 30 days
Students, Staff	1	Varies	varies

The Ombuds role is one of neutrality—neither an advocate for the complaining nor the accused party (Rowe, 1995). Yet, the Florida statute (1995) establishing the

student ombudsman office within the state university system is contrary to this by referring to the Ombudsman as a student advocate. Contrary to the statute, the role at state institutions is one of liaison and resource officer. Students expecting advocacy and partiality are usually disappointed and unsatisfied.

Since the re-organization of the Ombuds office at the University of Florida in January 1997, student traffic and awareness of the office have increased significantly—from 135 cases in 1996 to 150 cases during the first six months of 1997. In reality, the numbers are higher as they do not account for the problems or questions that are easily or readily resolved with some student's initial phone call or inquiry. A summary of the magnitude of students serviced and the categories of complaints handled through the office are attached as Attachments 1, 2, and 3.

In the initial contact phase with the Ombuds office, students at the University of Florida, as well as most of the institutions surveyed, are asked to complete a short written statement outlining their perception of the problem. A written description of the problem helps students recognize the actual problem and assists them in making informed decisions concerning the appropriate steps for resolution or methods of intervention (Spratlen & Neff, 1996). The Ombuds process also can be viewed as a tool for students to learn the most effective way to handle problems on their own.

The program at the University of Michigan proposes to "educate students about university policies, procedures, and institutional resources available to them [and]

promote the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills by helping students act on their own behalf in resolving conflicts" (University of Michigan, 1997).

CONCLUSION

Although structured differently at most institutions as to defined role and responsibility, an Ombudsman makes a significant and important contribution to the quality of life on campus. The essence of the office provides a responsible, trustworthy, and confidential service to those seeking advice and assistance in solving problems. At the same time, it has the potential to teach students to manage their own conflicts in a responsible manner. Unfortunately, the services of this office are easily undervalued and misunderstood. Although the contributions made to the institution by the Ombudsman may not be evident or appreciated (Spratlen & Neff, 1996), it is a continually growing administrative role. Credibility and objectivity are the cornerstones for exemplary Ombuds service (Hayden, 1996). The Ombudsman is expected to guide the process based on accurate information, institutional collaboration, and objectivity and should be viewed as a valuable institutional resource.

The author is grateful to Scott Yaccarino for his diligent assistance in collecting data, gathering information and pursuing survey responses.

ATTACHMENT 1

SEX	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Males	15	8	22	14	23	12	21	25	11	5	14	11	181
Females	7	14	7	8	8	14	12	28	11	7	14	6	136
TOTAL	**22**	**22**	**29**	**22**	**31**	**26**	**33**	**53**	**22**	**12**	**28**	**17**	**317**

RACE	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Asian	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	8
Black	2	6	5	4	3	8	5	10	5	1	5	1	55
Hispanic	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	3	1	0	3	1	20
Indian	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Other	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
White	20	16	20	15	22	15	24	36	16	10	18	14	226
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	**22**	**22**	**29**	**22**	**31**	**26**	**33**	**53**	**22**	**12**	**28**	**17**	**317**

Academic Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
0	3	1	1	1	1	4	1	3	0	0	2	2	19
1	1	1	8	3	1	3	5	12	4	3	3	5	49
2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	6	4	5	5	0	36
3	3	4	4	3	8	8	10	12	5	1	7	2	67
4	10	10	9	9	12	8	9	16	7	2	10	7	109
5	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	8
6	1	1	0	1	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	10
7	1	2	1	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	10
8	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	6
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	**22**	**22**	**29**	**22**	**31**	**26**	**33**	**53**	**22**	**12**	**28**	**17**	**317**

ATTACHMENT 2

COLLEGE	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
Acct.	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
Agriculture	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	5	0	0	3	1	21
Architecture	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	10
Business	2	2	2	0	3	1	1	9	2	2	2	0	26
Bldg. Const.	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Continuing Ed.	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Education	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	9
Engineering	2	2	3	1	2	3	1	8	2	2	0	2	28
Fine Arts	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
Health & Human Perf.	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	4	3	1	0	0	14
Health Professions	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	6
Journalism	2	0	1	2	3	2	6	5	1	3	4	1	30
Liberal Arts	8	10	17	9	17	9	12	14	10	1	11	11	129
Law	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	6
Nursing	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	12
Occupational Therapy	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Overseas Studies	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pharmacy	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Vet. Med.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
UF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undecided	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	**22**	**22**	**29**	**22**	**31**	**26**	**33**	**53**	**22**	**12**	**28**	**17**	**317**

ATTACHMENT 3

CATEGORY	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTAL
ACADEMIC, College	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	1	10
ACADEMIC, Dishonesty	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ACADEMIC, Probation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
ACADEMIC, Suspension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
ADD, Retro	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
ADMISSIONS, College	0	0	3	4	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	17
ADMISSIONS, Reclassification	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
ADMISSIONS, Grad Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
ADMISSIONS, Requirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	6
APPEAL, College	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
APPEAL, Grade	6	4	1	0	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	27
CITIZEN CONCERN, College Req.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
COLLEGE, Requirement	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	5
COMPLAINT, Discrimination	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
DROP, Current	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
DROP, Retro	1	2	1	3	1	3	2	5	4	1	3	0	26
FEES, Application	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
FEES, Books	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
FEES, Refund	4	5	0	2	6	4	2	3	3	2	2	1	34
FEES, Registration	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
FINANCIAL AID, Loan	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
FINANCIAL AID	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	3	0	14
GRIEVANCE, Instructor	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	2	15
GRIEVANCE, program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
HOLD, College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
HOLD, Financial	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	5
HOLD, Judicial	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
HOLD, Registration	0	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	9
HOLD, Student Services	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
HOUSING, Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	5
HOUSING, Fees	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
HOUSING, Qualification	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LEARN.DISAB: Drop, Retro	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
LEARN DISAB: WD, Retro	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LEARN DISAB: Waiver, G. Rule	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
OVERSEAS STUDIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
RECORDS REQUEST	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
REGISTRATION	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	7
RESIDENCY	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	10
TRAFFIC & PARKING	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	5
TRANSCRIPT, Request	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TUITION, Prepay	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
WAIVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
WAIVER, Admissions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
WAIVER, Clast	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
WAIVER, College	2	2	6	1	7	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	23
WAIVER, Gordon Rule	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
WAIVER, Graduation	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	9
WITHDRAW, Refund	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
WITHDRAW, Retro	1	1	5	1	3	2	3	6	3	0	0	0	25
TOTAL	**22**	**22**	**29**	**22**	**31**	**26**	**33**	**53**	**22**	**12**	**28**	**17**	**317**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, T. (1995). "Vocabulary of ADR procedures (Part 1)," *Dispute Resolution Journal*, Vol. 50(4).

Guerra N. and G. Elliott (1996). "Ombudsing in an educational institution: Use of implicit and explicit power," *The Journal – 1996*. Ed. Ron Wilson. Asilomar, *CA:* California Caucus of College & University Ombudsmen, 1996.

Hayden, S. (1996). *The University of Florida Ombuds Office: A review with reflections and recommendations*, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Hoppe, D. and B. Culhane (eds.) (1995). *The UCOA Ombuds Handbook*, The University and College Ombuds Association.

Rowe, M. (1995). *Options, functions and skills: What an organizational ombudsperson might want to know*, The Ombudsman Association, Dallas, TX.

Spratlen, L. & S. Neff (1996). "Academic Ombudsing: Process, roles and relationships," *The Journal – 1996*. Ed. Ron Wilson. Asilomar, CA: California Caucus of College & University Ombudsmen, 1996.

State of Florida (1995). *Section 240.2098: University student ombudsman office*, *Florida Statutes*, State of Florida, Tallahassee, FL.

Stieber, C. (1991). "Reflections: Seventeen years as MSU Ombudsman." *MSU Alumni Magazine, Fall 1991*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

University of California-Berkeley (1997). *Ethical principles for university and college ombudspersons.* http://stfombuds.berkeley.edu/Ombuds

University of Florida (1997). *Office of the Ombudsman,* http://www/ombudsman/ufl.edu.

University of Minnesota (1997). *Student Dispute Resolution Center.* http://www.tc.umn.edu/nlhome/g051/sos.

Vice, J. (1996). "Common Sense Revisited," *The Journal – 1996.* Ed. Ron Wilson. Asilomar, CA: California Caucus of College & University Ombudsmen, 1996.

Wilson R. (1996). "Introduction," *The Journal – 1996.* Ed. Ron Wilson. Asilomar, CA: California Caucus of College & University Ombudsmen, 1996.

Survey Participants

Alabama A & M University
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Brandeis University
California State University at Sacramento
Clemson University
Cleveland State University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
East Carolina University
Emory University
Florida A&M University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International University
Harvard University
Indiana University-Bloomington
Iowa State University
Louisiana State University
McGill University
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
Montana State University
Montana Tech of the University of Montana
Montclair State University
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University
Northern Arizona University
Northwestern University
Oakland University
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Portland State University
Prairie View A&M University
Princeton University
Purdue University
Rice University
South Dakota State University
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
State University of New York at Albany
Syracuse University
The Catholic University of America
The Johns Hopkins University
The Ohio State University
The University of Alabama at Huntsville
The University of Montana
University at Buffalo-State Univ. of New York
University Center at Tulsa
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alaska, Fairbanks
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Diego
University of Central Florida
University of Chicago
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado

University of Delaware
University of Florida
University of Houston
University of Idaho
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
University of Massachusetts at Boston
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Missouri-Rolla
University of Nevada, Reno
University of New Orleans
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
University of North Dakota
University of North Florida
University of North Texas
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Southern California
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas, Austin
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wyoming
Utah State University
Vanderbilt University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Western Michigan University
Wichita State University
Wright State University
Yale University